DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 282 SO 005 465

AUTHOR Simmons, Dale D.; And Others
TITLE Humanistic Worldmindedness and Peace Proposal Preferences in Pacifist, ROTC, and Random Student Samples.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; Conflict Resolution; Higher Education; *Humanization; *Peace; *Political Attitudes; *Student Attitudes; *War; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Worldmindedness

ABSTRACT

Assuming that pacifist and ROTC allegiances are associated with differing basic orientations toward mankind and differing preferences for resolution of international conflict, the Worldmindedness Scale and the peace proposal preference procedures (developed by cooperating participants in the international survey "Images of the Year 2000") were administered to: 1) military (R.O.T.C.), 2) avowedly pacifist, and 3) "neutral" sample groups of the U.S. college students. Although polarity in beliefs was expected, it failed to emerge, and, instead, there was merely a difference in scale position. The pacifist students emerged as distinctly worldminded and tended to favor a socio-psychological control of aggression while the ROTC students were neutral toward worldmindedness and emphasized organization solutions toward aggression. However, a remarkably high level of agreement between groups was found regarding ways to achieve peace, the differences being matters of focus. The relationship of worldminded attitudes to peace proposal preferences suggests that the preference for direct control of aggression at the interpersonal and international levels is the minority orientation in the world today, mainstream peacethinking being primarily organizational in nature. (Author/SJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 075282

SP 005 465

HUMANISTIC WORLDMINDEDNESS AND PEACE PROPOSAL PREFERENCES IN PACIFIST, ROTC AND RANDOM STUDENT SAMPLES

Dale D. Simmons, Knud S. Larsen, Daniel Fajardo

Oregon State University

Abstract

Assuming that pacifist and ROTC allegiances are associated with differing basic orientations toward mankind and with differing preferences for resolution of international conflict, the Worldmindedness Scale and the peace proposal preference procedure developed by cooperating participants in the international survey "Images of the Year 2000" were administered to samples of military (R.O.T.C.), avowedly pacifist, and "neutral" groups of U.S.A. college students. The pacifist students emerged as distinctly worldminded, whereas the ROTC students scored near an absolute neutral point, suggesting that the structure of attitudes toward mankind associated with pacifist and ROTC allegiance is not bi-polar, but one of differences in scale position. A remarkably high level of agreement between groups was found regarding ways to achieve peace, the differences between groups appearing to be largely matters of emphasis or focus. Again a polarity in beliefs failed to emerge. The ROTC students tended to emphasize organizational solutions whereas the pacifists revealed a preoccupation with socio-psychological control of aggression. The relationship of worldminded attitudes to peace proposal preferences, suggests that the preference for direct control of aggression at the interpersonal and international levels, is the minority orientation in the world today, mainstream peacethinking being primarily organizational in nature.

(end of abstract)

In this world of conflict and potential conflict, there are several major approaches to international relations. Young people are often faced with decisions as to their allegiance to any of these styles. The two major campus groups which have active proselytizers pressing the young people for commitment are the ROTC and the pacifists. Although many young people do not seem influenced by the efforts of these two groups of proselytizers, many others appear to experience a great deal of "strain" in their effort to resolve the conflict between these two styles. The "strain" seems especially intense because the ROTC and the pacifist positions seem bipolar, requiring a commitment to one and a rejection of the other. Any attempt to understand the beliefs and attitudes of those who commit allegiance to one or the other of these positions is always complicated by the particular issues confronting the individual. For example, because of the controversy over the war in Viet Nam, it is often difficult to take a purely militarist or pacifist position. In the United States we find some ROTC students who are opposed to the Vietnam involvement appearing pacifist, and at the same time some pacifistically-inclined activists behave quite military "out of frustration".

Sampson and Smith (1957) in distinguishing between <u>international-mindedness</u> ("an interest in or knowledge about international affairs") and <u>worldmindedness</u> ("a frame of reference apart from knowledge about or interest in international relations. . .the individual who favors a world-view of humanity, whose primary reference group is mankind, rather than American, English, Chinese, etc.") seem to have proposed a distinction which could be one of the bases for favoring ROTC or adopting a pacifist position.

Allegiance to one of these positions could be a result of a more basic orientation to humanity, the pacifist allegiance deriving from a broad conception of the needs of mankind and the ROTC allegiance deriving from a more narrow allegiance to one's own specific local identity group. Thus, we would predict that avowed pacifists would have significantly higher scores on Sampson and Smith's W-scale than would militarists.

In addition to expecting pacifists and ROTC students to have differing orientations toward mankind, we should also expect them to have quite differing orientations toward the resolution of international conflict. In order to study similarities and differences in conflict resolution strategies among citizens of many nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain (and later in Asia), participants in the international survey, "Images of the Year 2000", sponsored by the European Coordination Centre for Research and Documentation in Social Science and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, developed an inventory of 25 peace proposals to which the individual was asked to express his agreement or disagreement (Larsen, 1970). Although designed for international comparisons, this instrument seems especially promising as a means of exploring conflict resolution styles of the ROTC students and the pacifist. In particular we would expect a negative correlation between ROTC students' and pacifists' preferences for achieving peace.

In addition, if we assume the ROTC and pacifist positions to be bipolar allegiances, we would expect that the peace proposal preferences of a sample of world-citizenry would fall somewhere between these extreme positions. It would thus be predicted that there would be, in addition to

a negative correlation between the ROTC students and the pacifists, a zero order correlation between a world-citizen sample and each of the two forms of allegiance.

To assess the above predictions the following study was undertaken.

Method

Subjects: Three groups of students attending Oregon State University, U.S.A., served as subjects. The ROTC position was represented by 103 junior and senior male students who volunteered for the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC); the pacifist position was represented by a group of 27 male and 12 female students who avowed to be pacifists to a student majoring in social psychology (the psychology student obtained this sample primarily by circulating among those students who were suspected of pacifist leanings), and a "neutral" student position was represented by a group of 26 males and 25 females attending a sophomore level General Psychology course during the summer session (it was assumed that there was no basis for expecting students taking such a course to be either militaristically or pacifistically inclined).

Questionnaires: The subjects all completed the 32-item Worldmindedness W-scale (Sampson and Smith, 1957). The items in the Worldmindedness Scale were selected from 60 items on the basis of item analysis, with the requirement that there be 16 pro-worldminded and 16 anti-worldminded items. The items which were retained in the final scale discriminated between upper and bottom 10% by at least 2 scale points. Corrected split-half and test-retest reliability is .93. The worldmindedness scale correlated negatively (-.71) with the E Scale and (-.53) with the

California Political-Economic Conservatism Scale. The scale also discriminated between Quakers (known for worldmindedness) and samples of students. The subjects also rank ordered the 25 peace proposals as developed by the "Images of the Year 2000" participants (Larsen, 1970).

Results

Differences in Worldmindedness: The means and standard deviations on the W-scale were as follows: pacifist students --$\bar{X}$ = 158.83, s.d. = 14.76; General Psychology students -- $\bar{X}$ = 130.35, s.d. = 27.61; ROTC students -- $\bar{X}$ = 101.82, s.d. = 22.92. By t-test all three groups were significantly different from one another at the .001 level. It should be noted that the General Psychology students represent a point exactly equidistant between the two other groups; i.e., they scored 28 points below the pacifist students and 28 points above the ROTC group. As the W-scale runs from 0 to 192 points, with a theoretical midpoint at 96, it would be best to describe the pacifist group as decidedly worldminded, the General Psychology group as somewhat worldminded, and the ROTC group as neutral with regards to worldmindedness. The mean score for the pacifists (158) is quite comparable to the mean score of the Quaker International Voluntary Service students (155), a group identified by Sampson and Smith (1957) as a known worldminded group. The General Psychology mean (130) seems comparable to the "various student population means . . . ranging between 123 and 128" as cited by Sampson and Smith. Thus, the militarists seem at an opposite pole from the pacifists only when viewed from relative group scores. On an absolute score level basis, the militarists differ from the pacifists only in degree of worldmindedness, the militarists (as a group) being

neutral and the pacifists distinctly worldminded. From this it would seem that the bi-polarity of basic attitudes may be more apparent than real and it would be best to describe the groups as differing only in scale position, not in polar position.

Peace proposal preferences: The peace proposal preferences of citizens from eleven nations (Czechoslovakia, Finland, Great Britain, India, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain and Yogoslavia), based on data provided by "Images of the Year 2000", studies (Larsen, 1970) are found in Table 1, as are the preference rankings of the military, ROTC and General Psychology students, and the correlations between peace proposal preferences and the worldmindedness scale. Table 2 presents the Coefficient of Concordance (W) within each of the three student groups. As all three coefficients are significant beyond the .001 level by Chi-square test, we may proceed with confidence that the agreement within each group is beyond the chance level. However, on examination of the average rank order correlation (r_s ave), the pacifists and the General Psychology students would appear to have a greater degree of unity of belief than do the ROTC (.48 and .40 compared to .20).

The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients (rho) among the groups are found in Table 3 and reveal a remarkably high level of agreement among the groups as to priorities desirable for attaining peace. The lowest correlation among the world citizenry and the three student groups is the .620 between the ROTC and pacifist student groups. Even though these two groups emerge as the most different we again fail to find the polarity of positions which was predicted. The correlation is not negative, but positive, and the level of the correlation is such that a case could be

made for the two groups being sub-samples of a single population. A close examination, however, of the specific peace proposal preferences of these two groups reveals some very interesting differences between them. Table 4 illustrates in simple form that the greatest differences between the ROTC and the pacifists are not in terms of polar position, but rather in emphasis of preference to certain peace proposals. Each of these groups emphasize two proposals and de-emphasize two proposals toward which the other group is neutral. Hence, in attempting to "debate" the issues the proposals put forward by one group might be met with indifference by the other group and vice-versa. This may result in one of those parodies of communication produced by theaters of the absurd, in which two persons appear to be communicating but neither is listening to the other. Each is concerned with what is of positive and negative importance to him and is indifferent to the other position (especially that which the other finds of positive and negative importance). Consideration of Table 4 suggests that the ROTC student emphasizes organizational relationships; e.g., the U.N. and aid by developed countries to developing countries, while they de-emphasize proposals to reduce military nationalism. The pacifist on the other hand seems especially to focus upon aggression per se, at both the individual and the socio-political level, and tends to de-emphasize economic and military proposals for the achievement of peace. Hence, the preferential emphasis of the ROTC student seems to be on organizational structures, while the pacifist is focused upon aggressive behavior and is inclined to reject economic solutions. Although some of these differences might have been anticipated, the finding that there is a remarkably high level of agreement between pacifists and ROTC students in overall priorities for peace achievement

seems especially significant. Certainly there are differences in belief, but these differences are matters of degree, emphasis, and/or focus, not of polar positions. The ROTC group and the pacifists have more in common than they have differences, so that the apparent separation of the two groups is not as great as might have been believed. Conflict between these two groups over ways to resolve disputes is, therefore, not a matter of basic differences in belief structure, but conflict over the use of a particular procedure at a particular time.

The extremely high correlations between the American military and General Psychology students and the eleven-nation citizenry is remarkable. It would seem that the thinking of these ROTC students does, in fact, represent the kind of thinking, the belief structure, of citizens of many parts of the world. As such, their beliefs would best be described as "mainstream" whereas the pacifists would be described as "less" mainstream (even though the pacifists show a rather high level of agreement with the world citizenry). From another vantage point it would appear that "mainstream" peacethinking is more organizationally oriented than psychologically oriented; i.e., the preoccupation with national organizations, whereas the pacifist emphasizes the direct control of aggression at the inter-personal (Item #2) and world-wide levels (Item #15). Further elaboration of this conclusion follows in the next section.

Peacethinking in Relation to Worldmindedness: When all three groups of students were combined into a single sample and their scores on the Worldmindedness Scale were correlated (product-moment) with each of the peace proposals, it was possible to obtain a "Worldmindedness peacethinking" ranking of the proposals. This ranking is found in Table 1 and suggests

that the Worldmindedness ranking is even more anti-military than the pacifist; i.e., three of the four top and bottom ranks refer to military alliances and to disarmament. That the Worldmindedness dimension would result in the promotion of a world state (proposal number 25) is not surprising, but the de-emphasis of the U.N. should require some analysis. Proposal number 22 which recommends improvement of the U.N., receives only a rank order position of 21 which is quite low. To the worldminded individual the U.N., even though it has accomplished humanitarian tasks, may still be viewed as an extension of the nationalistic mentality. This is exemplified by the use of armed forces by the U.N. to resolve conflicts (a technique rejected emphatically by the worldminded) and consequently a low valuing of the U.N. as a means of achieving peace.

The rank order correlations between the Worldmindedness peacethinking rankings and the other rankings are as follows: with the military student rankings .014; with the eleven-nation citizenry .316; with the General Psychology students .367; and with the pacifist students .679. These correlations suggest that the main reason the pacifists differ from the other students (and the eleven-nation citizenry) is in their preferences for direct control of aggression versus the organizational solutions of the majority. These correlations would also appear to support the earlier contention that mainstream peacethinking is more pre-occupied with relationships between organizations than persons.

Peace proposal rankings by an eleven-nation citizenry; by students with militaristic and pacifistic and "neutral" allegiance; and on Pearson product-moment correlations with the Worldmindedness scale.

		Ranks					
Item Number	Correlations with Worldmindedness Scale	Eleven Nation Citizenry	Militarist Students	Pacifist Students	"Neutral" Students	World-Minded	
5	.13	1	2	3	1	9	Hunger and poverty should be abolished all over the world.
19	.14	2	6	5	6	8	We should have increased trade, exchange and cooperation between countries that are not on friendly terms.
12	.28	3	9	9	5	3	The gap between the rich and the poor countries should disappear.
22	-.22	4	1	11	4	21	We should improve the United Nations so as to make it more efficient than it is today.
10	-.07	5	4	12	9	15	Developed countries should give more technical assistance and aid to developing countries than they do today.

Table 1 (continued)

3	.04	6	5	4	2	14.	One should create more peaceful relations in the family, at school, and at work.
6	-.15	6.5	3	8	3	18	It should be possible for people to choose their governments freely all over the world.
7	.08	7.5	7	7	7	12	All countries should stop completely from intervening into the internal affairs of other countries.
15	.48	9	11	1	8	1	We should have general and complete disarmament as soon as possible.
4	.19	10	10	6	12	6	The colonial system should be abolished all over the world.
2	.28	11	13	2	10	5	One should start with the single individual everywhere and make him less aggressive.
24	-.11	12	8	14	11	17	We should have a strong internationa peace-keeping force that can stop aggression from any country or group of countries.

Table 1 (continued)

8	-.07	13	14	20	15	16	Countries should be (politically, economically, socially) more similar to each other than today.
21	.14	14	18	17	19	7	Small countries all over the world should unite to have more influence o the affairs of the world.
13	-.21	15	12	21	16	20	An economy based on a mixture of private and public ownership should be introduced all over the world.
23	.04	17	15	15	13	13	A world language that can be understood in all countries should be adopted all over the world.
14	-.45	18	20	24	23	24	Countries should be members of milita alliances so that no country or group of countries dare attack others.
16	.28	19	21	13	17	4	Countries should withdraw from military alliances.
17	-.62	20	16	25	24	25	Countries should keep national armies

Table 1 (continued)

11	.12	21	24	18	20	10	An economy based mainly on public ownership should be introduced all over the world.
25	.45	22	23	10	14	2	We should have a world state, with disappearance of national borders, with an efficient world government.
1	-.16	23	17	16	18	19	People should become more religious all over the world.
18	-.30	24	25	22	25	22	Countries should have less to do with each other and become self-sufficient
9	-.45	25	19	23	22	23	An economy based mainly on private ownership should be introduced all over the world.

Table 2

Coefficients of Concordance among Peace Proposal Rankings Obtained from the Student Groups

	Coefficients of Concordance W	Chi-Square	$r_{s\,ave}$
Military	.258	506.73*	.205
General Psychology	.414	637.77*	.402
Pacifist	.500	468.00*	.486

*All Chi-Squares significant at .001 level.

Table 3

Correlations (rho) Among Peace Proposal Rankings Obtained from Different Groups

	Military Students	General Psychology Students	Pacifist Students
Eleven Nation Citizenry	.895	.886	.720
Military Students		.828	.620
General Psychology Students			.855

N = 25, rho = .54, P = .01

Table 3

Correlations (rho) Among Peace Proposal Rankings

Obtained from Different Groups

	Military Students	General Psychology Students	Pacifist Students
Eleven Nation Citizenry	.895	.886	.720
Military Students		.828	.620
General Psychology Students			.855

N = 25, rho = .54, P = .01

Table 4

Comparison of Major Differences in Peace Proposal Ranks for the Military and the Pacifist Student Group

Item	Ranks: Military	Ranks: Pacifist	
			Proposals emphasized by the military but neutral to the pacifist students
22	1	11	We should improve the U.N. so as to make it more efficient than it is today.
10	4	12	Developed countries should give more technical assistance and aid to developing countries than they do today.
			Proposals de-emphasized by the military but neutral to pacifist students
25	23	10	We should have a world state, with disappearance of national boundaries, with an efficient world government.
16	21	13	Countries should withdraw from military alliances.
			Proposals emphasized by the pacifist students but neutral to the militarists
15	11	1	We should have general and complete disarmament as soon as possible.
2	13	2	One should start with the single individual everywhere and make him less aggressive.
			Proposals de-emphasized by the pacifist students but neutral to the militarists
17	16	25	Countries should keep national armies.
13	12	21	An economy based on a mixture of private and public ownership should be introduced all over the world.

REFERENCES

Sampson, D.L., and Smith, H.P. A scale to measure worldminded attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1957, 45, 99-106.

Larsen, K.S. Objective and Subjective Power As Determined, of Peace Agreement, Pessimism-Optimism and Expectation of World Conflict. Stencil, European Coordination Centre For Research and Documentation In Social Sciences, 1970.